

Appl. No. 10/802,545

Response Dated November 1, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action Dated June 1, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-67 remain in this application. Independent Claims 1, 31, and 65-67 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US20040149431 to Wylie. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Wylie fails to teach each of the limitations of the claimed invention and, therefore, fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

Applicant has amended the claims to recite "generating a summary of a drillstring for each hole section of a wellbore in response to said input data, the summary providing a drillstring design for the wellbore geometry of each hole section of the wellbore." Support for this amendment is found, for example, at Figure 19 (depicting the diameters of the wellbore at various hole sections) and paragraph 1266 of the published application (describing the drill pipe size based on the hole section). *See also, e.g., paragraphs 1105* (different drillstring is created for every hole section) *and 1242* (drillstring design logical expressions 66 will: check that all drillstring components will fit into the wellbore geometry). The claim amendments clarify that the drillstring design is tailored to the wellbore geometry at each hole section. No such features are provided by the art of record.

Wylie describes techniques for constructing a Monowell. *See, e.g., Wylie paragraph 0002.* The Examiner suggests that Wylie discloses information needed in planning and constructing a monodiameter wellbore. *See Office Action, p. 2.* Wylie may indicate that well planning is performed for a monodiameter wellbore, but provides no disclosure on any

Appl. No. 10/802,545

Response Dated November 1, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action Dated June 1, 2007

applications using multiple hole sections of a wellbore or how such planning is performed. The Examiner further suggests that Wylie discloses techniques that allow the operator to visualize, analyze and interpret MWD/LWD and drilling operational data in real-time. *See Office Action, p. 3.* However, Wylie's real-time drilling operations provides no suggestion for generating a well plan or for generating a drillstring design for each hole section during well planning (which occurs prior to drilling).

Wylie fails to even contemplate generating a drillstring design for the wellbore geometry at each hole section of a wellbore as recited in Applicant's claims. Wylie focuses on the concerns of monodiameter wellbore constructions and fails to address how drillstring designs are provided. There is simply no disclosure recognition in Wylie of the problem of drillstring design for each hole section of a wellbore, or the need to have a drillstring design tailored to each hole section of the wellbore. Where there is no disclosure in the art of record for the limitation as claimed, the art of record fails to anticipate the claimed invention. Moreover, there is no suggestion in the art of record for the claimed limitation. Thus, Wylie fails to anticipate or render obvious the present claims.

B. Additional Arguments

Applicant further reasserts its arguments made in the previous responses filed on March 13, 2007, January 16, 2007 and September 18, 2006.

In view of the above, Wylie fails to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant, therefore, requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this

Appl. No. 10/802,545

Response Dated November 1, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action Dated June 1, 2007

application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

This paper is submitted in response to the Final Office Action dated June 1, 2007, for which the three-month date for response is September 1, 2007. A two month extension of time is hereby requested, bringing the date for response to November 1, 2007. Please apply any charges not covered or any credits, to Deposit Account 07-1078 (Reference Number 94.0076).

Date: 11/1/07

Respectfully submitted,

Jennie J.L. Salazar, Reg. No. 45,065
Intellectual Property Counsel
Schlumberger Information Solutions
5599 San Felipe, Suite 1208
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 513-3754
Facsimile: (713) 513-2056

11/02/2007 VBU111 00000032 071078 10002545
02 FC:1252 460.00 DA